## **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
700 STEWART STREET
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101

**ROBERT S. LASNIK** 

DISTRICT JUDGE (206) 370-8810

May 30, 2017

## **Delivered Via CM/ECF**

RE: <u>Wright v. Progressive Northwestern Ins. Co.</u>, C16-1798RSL Stipulated Protective Order

## Dear Counsel:

On May 25, 2017, the Court received your Stipulated Motion for Protective Order on Documents and Information Produced in Response to Defendant's Subpoena to Produce to Wright Chiropractic, P.S. (Dkt. # 13).

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c), protective orders may be entered to protect confidential commercial information and/or to limit the scope of specific disclosures. Such protective orders may issue upon a showing of good cause. Although parties may agree on confidentiality among themselves, when they request that the Court be involved, the proposed order must be narrowly drawn, identifying both the type of information that is to be protected and, if not obvious, the reason such protection is warranted.

The parties' request to file confidential materials under seal raises additional concerns. This is a public court and its business should be conducted publicly unless there is a specific reason to keep things confidential. As stated in Local Civil Rule 5(g), "There is a strong presumption of public access to the court's files."

The stipulated protective order submitted in this case is deficient in the following respects:

The Court will not pre-authorize the filing of documents under seal simply because the parties have designated them as "confidential" during discovery. See Local Civil Rule 26(c)(2). If a party seeks to file documents under seal in this case, it must obtain authorization to do so by filing a stipulation and proposed order or a motion regarding the *specific* documents at issue.

The stipulated protective order received by the Court will remain lodged in the file, but will not be entered. The parties may resubmit a proposed order if they remedy the deficiencies identified in this letter.

Sincerely,

MMS (asuik Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge